REMARKS

Status

      This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 14, 2007, in which Claims 1-10 were rejected. No claims have been canceled; Claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 have been amended; and new Claims 11-15 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-15 are pending in the application, and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Amended Claims

      Claims 5, 9, and 10 have been amended to correct clerical matters. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103

      Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,951,536 (*Yokoi*) in view of WO 01/99703 (*Nemeth*). As best understood, the Office Action's position is that *Yokoi* teaches steps a) and c) of Claim 1, but does not teach steps b), d), e), f), g), and h). Specifically, that *Yokoi* does not teach the steps of forming of an examination bundlette, automatically detecting, signaling an alarm, receiving an automatic notification, routing the automatic notification, and executing one or more diagnostic steps. The Office Action indicates that these steps are described in *Nemeth*, and since *Nemeth* is in the field of "monitoring medical data", it would have been obvious to modify *Yokoi* with *Nemeth* in order to analyze and respond to the medical data in a timely manner. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

      The present invention is not obvious in view of *Yokoi* and *Nemeth* since contrary to the Office Action's position, *Yokoi* does not teach or describe a feature claimed in Claim 1.

      Amended Claim 1 clarifies the processing of the examination bundlette as image processing by now reciting the step of "image processing the examination bundlette". This feature of the invention is described on Page 8, lines 19-23 as:

> "The Examination Bundlette is first decompressed, decomposed and processed in the Examination Bundlette processing step **510**.

In this step, the image data portion of the Examination Bundlette is subjected to image processing algorithms such as filtering, enhancing, and geometric correction."

Accordingly, the bundlette is image processed wherein an action/change is made to the image data portion of the bundlette.

In contrast, *Yokoi* does not describe or suggest image processing. Rather, *Yokoi* at Col. 19, lines 29-35 describes "comparative processing such as pattern matching" to make "a decision as to whether there is a similarity". This "comparative processing" cannot be equated with image processing as there is no action/change taken to *Yokoi's* image – that is, *Yokoi's* image remains the same.

Since neither *Yokoi* or *Nemeth* teaches or describes a feature claimed in Claim 1, Claim 1 is not obvious from these references whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Claims 2-10 are dependent on Claim 1, and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 1, Claims 2-10 are also believed to be patentable.

New Claims

New Claims 11-15 have been added. These claims are dependent on Claim 1, and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 1, Claims 11-15 are also believed to be patentable

Further, neither reference teaches the feature of Claim 11 of processing the examination bundlette by applying image processing algorithms to an image portion of the examination bundlette. This feature of the invention is described in the Specification on Page 8, lines 19-23.

In addition, neither reference teaches the feature of Claim 12 of automatically detecting one or more abnormalities in one or more of the vivo images in the examination bundlette based on predetermined image criteria for the patient.

Further, neither reference teaches the feature of Claim 13 of automatically detecting one or more abnormalities in one or more of the vivo

images in the examination bundlette based on predetermined image criteria for the patient employing image data transformation and detection.

Neither reference teaches the feature of Claim 14 of processing the examination bundlette by transforming image data of an image portion of the examination bundlette to a generalized color space; and detecting the one or more abnormalities by applying thresholding. This feature of the invention is described in the Specification on Page 11, lines 13-20 and Page 13, lines 7-17. Still further, neither reference teaches the feature of Claim 15 of applying thresholding by applying lower/higher thresholding or higher thresholding. This feature of the invention is described in the Specification on Page 11, lines 13-20 and Page 13, lines 7-17.

Summary

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,324

Susan L. Parulski
Carestream Health, Inc.
Rochester, NY 14650-2201
Telephone: (585) 724-9401
Facsimile: (585) 724-9400